
N 70 25368 NASA GRIU9483

Office of Naval Research

Contract N00014-67-A-0298-0006 NR-372-012

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION
Grant NGR 22-007-068

NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR OPTIMALITY FOR SINGULAR CONTROL PROBLEMS: A LIMIT APPROACH



David H. Jacobson and Jason L. Speyer

March 1970

Technical Report No. 604

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted by the U. S. Government.

Division of Engineering and Applied Physics Harvard University + Cambridge, Massachusetts

Office of Naval Research

Contract N00014-67-A-0298-0006

NR-372-012

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Grant NGR 22-007-068

NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR OPTIMALITY FOR SINGULAR CONTROL PROBLEMS: A LIMIT APPROACH

By

David H. Jacobson and Jason L. Speyer

Technical Report No. 604

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted by the U. S. Government.

March 1970

The research reported in this document was made possible through support extended the Division of Engineering and Applied Physics, Harvard University by the U. S. Army Research Office, the U. S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research and the U. S. Office of Naval Research under the Joint Services Electronics Program by Contracts N00014-67-A-0298-0006, 0005, and 0008 and by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under Grant NGR 22-007-068.

Division of Engineering and Applied Physics

Harvard University · Cambridge, Massachusetts

NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR OPTIMALITY
FOR SINGULAR CONTROL PROBLEMS: A LIMIT APPROACH

By

David H. Jacobson and Jason L. Speyer Division of Engineering and Applied Physics

Harvard University: Cambridge, Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

Necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality for singular control problems are presented for the case where the extremal path is totally singular. The singular second variation is converted into a nonsingular one by addition of a quadratic functional of the control; a parameter $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ multiplies this added functional. By allowing ϵ to approach infinity the optimality conditions are deduced for the singular problem from the limiting optimality conditions of the synthesized nonsingular second variation. The resulting conditions are Jacobson's sufficient conditions in slightly modified form. In a companion paper necessity of Jacobson's conditions for a class of singular problems is demonstrated by exploiting the Kelley transformation technique which converts the singular second variation into a nonsingular one in a reduced dimensional state space.

Senior Analyst, Analytical Mechanics Associates, Inc., Cambridge, Mass. Supported by NASA Contract NAS 12-656.

I. Preliminaries

1. Introduction

In [1] a new necessary condition of optimality for singular control problems is developed and is shown to be nonequivalent to the well known generalized Legendre-Clebsch (or Kelley) condition. In [2] sufficient conditions for non-negativity of the singular second variation are presented; in strengthened form these are sufficient for a weak minimum. The sufficiency conditions, which are in the form of linear algebraic equalities and inequalities, also yield insight into nonsingular control problems and into the behavior of the important matrix Riccati differential equation [3]. Relationship of the above new conditions of optimality to existing necessary conditions is discussed in [1], [2]; thus, we refer the reader to these papers for general references to research in singular control (variational) problems.

In this paper we show that, with slight modification, the sufficiency conditions presented in [2] are also necessary for non-negativity of the singular second variation. Moreover, we show that these conditions are indeed necessary and sufficient for a weak minimum for a class of singular control problems. In certain cases a strong minimum is implied. We prove these results by a limit argument. The singular second variation is converted into a nonsingular one by the addition of a term $\frac{1}{2\epsilon}\int u^T u\,dt$, $\epsilon>0$. By allowing ϵ to approach infinity we deduce the optimality conditions for the singular problem from the limiting optimality conditions of the synthesized nonsingular second variation. This limit approach has been used previously [4] as a computational technique for solving singular optimal control problems.

In a companion paper [5] we prove necessity of the conditions given in [2] by exploiting the Kelley transformation technique [6]which converts the singular second variation into a nonsingular second variation in a state space of reduced dimension. In the reduced state space the equivalence is established of the sufficiency conditions [2] and the existence of the solution of the Riccati differential equation (Jacobi or Conjugate Point Condition) associated with this nonsingular second variation. This proves the necessity of the conditions given in [2]. Disadvantages of the transformation technique are in its algebraic complexity and in the need for the coefficients of the second variation (which depend upon time) to be many times differentiable. Moreover if the problem is singular of order p (i.e. $\frac{d^2p}{dt^2p}$ H_u contains the control u, where H is the variational Hamiltonian) the transformation technique must be applied repeatedly, p times, before a nonsingular problem is obtained. + Nevertheless, the transformation technique does give another viewpoint and ties together the conditions given in [1], [2] and the pioneering work of Kelley et al. [6] and Robbins [7]. Independently Goh [8] and McDanell and Powers [9], using Goh's transformation technique [10], have arrived at similar results.

The limit approach presented in this paper has the following advantageous features:

i) A direct proof of necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality is obtained without the need to transform the problem to a reduced state space.

 $^{^{\}dagger}$ A nonsingular problem is unattainable if u does not appear in a time derivative of H_{u} .

- ii) The concept of "order of the singular arc p" is not required in the proof.
- iii) Differentiability requirements are not as severe as those demanded in [5].

2. Problem Formulation

We shall consider a class of control problems where the dynamic system is described by the ordinary differential equations

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u, t)$$
; $x(t_0) = x_0$ (given) (1)

where

$$f(x, u, t) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} f_1(x, t) + f_{11}(x, t)u$$
 (2)

The performance of the system is measured by the cost functional

$$V[u(\cdot)] = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \{L_1(x,t) + u^T L_2(x,t)\} dt + F(x(t_f))$$
 (3)

and the terminal states must satisfy

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}})) = 0 . (4)$$

The control function $u(\cdot)$ is required to satisfy the constraint

$$u(\cdot) \in U$$
 (5)

where the set U is defined by

$$U \triangleq U_1 \cap U_2 \tag{6}$$

where

$$U_{1} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \{u(\cdot): u_{\min} \leq u_{i}(t) \leq u_{\max}, t \in [t_{o}, t_{f}], i = 1, \dots, m,$$

$$where u_{\min} > -\infty, u_{\max} < +\infty\}$$
(7)

and

$$U_2 \triangleq \{u(\cdot): u(\cdot) \text{ is piecewise continuous in } [t_0, t_f]\}$$
 (8)

In the above formulation x is an n-dimensional state vector and u is an m-dimensional control vector. The function f_1 is an n-dimensional

vector function of x at time t, f_u is an n x m matrix function of x at time t and L_2 is an m-dimensional vector function of x at time t; the functions L_1 and F are scalar. The terminal equality constraint function ψ is an s-dimensional column vector function of $x(t_f)$.

In the sequel we shall use the following assumptions.

Assumption 1. The initial and final times t_0 , t_f are given explicitly, $-\infty < t_0 < t_f < \infty$.

Assumption 2. The functions f, L_1 , L_2 are three times continuously differentiable in each argument, and the functions F and ψ are three times continuously differentiable in $x(t_f)$.

With the above formulation and assumptions in mind, we now state the optimal control problem: Determine the control function $u(\cdot)$ which satisfies (1), (4) and (5) and which minimizes $V[u(\cdot)]$.

3. Totally Singular Problems

Along an optimal trajectory it is well known that the following necessary conditions (Pontryagin's Principle) hold:

$$-\dot{\lambda} = H_{\mathbf{x}}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}, \overline{\mathbf{u}}, \lambda, t) \quad ; \quad \lambda(t_{\mathbf{f}}) = \lambda_{\mathbf{o}} F_{\mathbf{x}}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}(t_{\mathbf{f}}) + \psi_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{T}} \nu$$
 (9)

where

$$\overline{u} = \underset{u_{\min} \leq u_{i} \leq u_{\max}}{\operatorname{arg \, min}} H(\overline{x}, u, \lambda, t)$$
(10)

and

$$H(x, u, \lambda, t) \triangleq \lambda_0 \{L_1(x, t) + u^T L_2(x, t)\} + \lambda^T f(x, u, t) . \tag{11}$$

Here $\overline{u}(\cdot)$, $\overline{x}(\cdot)$ denote the candidate control and state functions, $\lambda(\cdot)$ is an n-vector of Lagrange multiplier functions of time and λ_0 is a constant ≥ 0 . Associated with the terminal constraint ψ is an s-vector of constant Lagrange multipliers ν .

Assumption 3. We shall assume that the control problem is normal so that λ_0 can be set equal to unity.

Definition 1. A totally singular arc is one along which

$$H_{u_i}(\overline{x}, \lambda, t) = 0$$
 ; $t \in [t_o, t_f]$, $i = 1, ..., m$ (12)

We now make

Assumption 4. $\overline{u}(\cdot)$, the candidate for a minimizing solution is continuous in t, totally singular, and $u_{\min} < \overline{u}_i(t) < u_{\max} \quad \forall t \in [t_o, t_f], i = 1, ..., m$.

In subsequent sections we develop necessary and sufficient conditions for this totally singular control function to be a minimizing solution (relative minimum).

II. Conditions for a Relative Minimum: Unconstrained Terminal State

1. The Second Variation (δ²V) and Associated Theorems

Before proceeding with the second variation we make the following definitions:

<u>Definition 2.</u> $V[u(\cdot)]$ has a weak relative minimum at $u(\cdot)$ if

$$V[u(\cdot)] - V[\overline{u}(\cdot)] \ge 0$$

$$\forall \mathtt{u}(\cdot) \in \mathtt{U} \ni \sup_{i=1,\ldots,n} \sup_{t_0 \leqslant t \leqslant t_f} \left| \begin{smallmatrix} \mathtt{x}_i & \overline{\mathtt{x}}_i \\ \end{smallmatrix} \right| + \sup_{j=1,\ldots,m} \sup_{t_0 \leqslant t \leqslant t_f} \left| \mathtt{u}_i & \overline{\mathtt{u}}_i \right| < \mathtt{w}$$

Note. Since $x(t_0) - \overline{x}(t_0) = 0$ the above restriction on $u(\cdot)$ is equivalent to $\|u(\cdot) - \overline{u}(\cdot)\| < w_1$

where

$$\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot) - \overline{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)\| \triangleq \sup_{j=1,\ldots,m} \sup_{t_0 \leq t \leq t_f} |\mathbf{u}_i - \overline{\mathbf{u}}_i|$$

and where $w_1 (< w)$ is sufficiently small.

<u>Definition 3.</u> $V[u(\cdot)]$ has a strong relative minimum at $\overline{u}(\cdot)$ if

$$V[u(\cdot)] - V[\overline{u}(\cdot)] \ge 0$$

$$\forall u(\cdot) \in U \ni \sup_{i=1,\ldots,n} \sup_{t_i \in t_f} |x_i - \overline{x}_i| < w$$

In the sequel we shall denote $u(\cdot) - \overline{u}(\cdot)$ by $\delta u(\cdot)$.

In the absence of terminal constraints (4) an expression for the second variation (for $\delta u(t)$ sufficiently small, $t \in [t_0, t_f]$) is:

$$\delta^{2}V[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] = \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \delta_{x}^{T} H_{xx} \delta_{x} + \delta_{u}^{T} H_{ux} \delta_{x} \right\}_{dt} + \frac{1}{2} \delta_{x}^{T} F_{xx} \delta_{x} \Big|_{t_{f}} (13)$$

subject to the linearized differential equation

$$\delta_{\dot{\mathbf{x}}} = f_{\dot{\mathbf{x}}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} + f_{\dot{\mathbf{u}}} \delta_{\mathbf{u}} \quad ; \qquad \delta_{\mathbf{x}}(t_{o}) = 0 \quad . \tag{14}$$

In (13), (14) partial derivatives are evaluated along \overline{u} , \overline{x} , λ .

We are led to the study of the second variation because of the following theorem [slightly altered form of Theorem 1, Gelfand and Fomin [11, p. 99]].

Theorem 1. A necessary condition for $V[u(\cdot)]$ to have a weak relative minimum at $\overline{u}(\cdot)$ is that $\delta^2 V[\delta u(\cdot)] \ge 0$ $V\delta u(\cdot)$ sufficiently small to justify the expansions (13), (14) and such that $\overline{u}(\cdot) + \delta u(\cdot) \in U$.

The condition $\delta^2 V[\delta u(\cdot)] \ge 0$ for all admissible $\delta u(\cdot)$ is necessary but not sufficient for the functional $V[u(\cdot)]$ to have a weak minimum at $\overline{u}(\cdot)$. A sufficient condition is provided by the following theorem.

Theorem 2. [Gelfand and Fomin [11, p. 100]] A sufficient condition for $V[u(\cdot)]$ to have a weak relative minimum at $\overline{u}(\cdot)$ is that $\delta^2 V[\delta u(\cdot)]$ be strongly positive.

Unfortunately, it turns out that the singular second variation cannot be strongly positive [12]. Here we prove this using arguments similar to those suggested by Johansen [13]. For simplicity of presentation let us consider the case where x and u are scalars; the arguments generalize to the vector case. Suppose that we set $\delta u(t) = b \sin qt$ $\forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$ and choose $b \ni u(\cdot) + \delta u(\cdot) \in U$. The solution of (14) when driven by this $\delta u(\cdot)$ is

⁺That is, $\delta^2 V[\delta_u(\cdot)] \ge k \|\delta_u(\cdot)\|^2 \ \forall \text{ admissible } \delta_u(\cdot), \text{ where } k > 0 \text{ is a constant.}$

$$\delta_{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathbf{b} \int_{t}^{t} \phi(t, \tau) f_{\mathbf{u}}(\tau) \sin q\tau \, d\tau$$
 (15)

where

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \phi(t, \tau) = f_{x}(t)\phi(t, \tau) \quad ; \quad \phi(\tau, \tau) = I \tag{16}$$

Integrating (15) by parts yields

$$\delta_{\mathbf{x}(t)} = \mathbf{b} \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{t} \left[\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \tau} (t, \tau) \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}(\tau) + \phi(t, \tau) \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}}{\partial \tau} (\tau) \right] \frac{1}{\mathbf{q}} \cos \mathbf{q} \tau \, d\tau \right\}$$

$$- f_{u}(t) \frac{1}{q} \cos qt + \phi(t, t_{o}) f_{u}(t_{o}) \frac{1}{q} \cos qt_{o}$$
 (17)

From (13),

$$\delta^{2}V[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] \leq \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{f}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left| H_{xx} \right| \delta_{x}^{2} + \left| \delta_{u} \right| \left| H_{ux} \right| \left| \delta_{x} \right| \right\} dt$$

$$+ \left| \frac{1}{2} \left| F_{xx} \right| \delta_{x}^{2} \right|_{t_{0}}$$

$$(18)$$

From (17),

$$|\delta_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{t})| \leq \frac{\mathbf{b}}{\mathbf{q}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbf{t}_{o}}^{\mathbf{t}} \left| \left[\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \tau} (\mathbf{t}, \tau) \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}(\tau) + \phi(\mathbf{t}, \tau) \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}}{\partial \tau} (\tau) \right] \right| \left| \cos \mathbf{q} \tau \right| d\tau$$

$$+ \left| \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{t}) \right| \left| \cos \mathbf{q} \mathbf{t} \right| + \left| \phi(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}_{o}) \right| \left| \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{t}_{o}) \right| \left| \cos \mathbf{q} \mathbf{t}_{o} \right| \right\}$$

$$\leq \frac{\mathbf{b}}{\mathbf{q}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbf{t}_{o}}^{\mathbf{t}} \left| \left[\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \tau} (\mathbf{t}, \tau) \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}(\tau) + \phi(\mathbf{t}, \tau) \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}}{\partial \tau} (\tau) \right] \right| d\tau$$

$$+ \left| \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{t}) \right| + \left| \phi(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}_{o}) \right| \left| \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{t}_{o}) \right| \right\}$$

$$(20)$$

$$\stackrel{\triangle}{=} \frac{b}{q} \cdot \beta(t) \tag{21}$$

Thus

$$\delta^{2}V[\delta_{u}(.)] \leq \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \{\frac{1}{2} |H_{xx}|(\frac{b}{q})^{2}\beta^{2} + \frac{b^{2}}{q}\beta |H_{ux}|\} dt + \frac{1}{2} |F_{xx}|(\frac{b}{q})^{2}\beta^{2}|_{t_{c}}$$
(22)

$$\stackrel{\Delta}{=} b^2 \left\{ \frac{d_1}{a^2} + \frac{d_2}{q} \right\} \tag{23}$$

Now if $\delta^2 V[\delta u(\cdot\,)]$ is strongly positive then $\exists\, k \text{ (constant)} > 0 \text{ such that}$

$$b^{2}\left\{\frac{d_{1}}{q^{2}} + \frac{d_{2}}{q}\right\} \geq k \|\delta_{u}(\cdot)\|^{2}, \quad \forall q ; \quad 0 < q < \infty$$
 (24)

Clearly (24) cannot hold for k a constant (> 0) since q can be made arbitrarily large (q is directly proportional to the frequency of the sine input). Thus $\delta^2 V[\delta u(\cdot)]$ cannot be strongly positive.

In view of the above failure of Theorem 2 for singular problems we offer the following more useful sufficiency theorem.

Theorem 3. A sufficient condition for $V[u(\cdot)]$ to have a minimum at $\overline{u}(\cdot)$ is that $\delta^2 V[\delta u(\cdot)] \ge 0$ for all admissible $\delta u(\cdot)$ and that

$$\delta^{2}V[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] \ge |\alpha[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)]| \|\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)\|^{2}$$
(25)

for $\left\| \delta_{u}(\cdot) \right\|$ sufficiently small, where

$$a[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] \triangleq \frac{V[\overline{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot) + \delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] - V[\overline{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] - \delta^{2}V[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)]}{\|\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)\|^{2}}$$
(26)

Proof. Let

$$\Delta V[\delta u(\cdot)] \triangleq V[\overline{u}(\cdot) + \delta u(\cdot)] - V[\overline{u}(\cdot)]$$

then, by Assumption 2,

$$\Delta V[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] = \delta^{2} V[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] + a[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] \|\delta_{u}(\cdot)\|^{2}$$
(27)

where $a[\delta u(\cdot\,)] \longrightarrow 0$ as $\left\|\,\delta u(\cdot\,)\,\right\| \longrightarrow 0.$ From (27) and (25),

$$\Delta V[\delta_{\mathrm{u}}(\cdot)] - \alpha[\delta_{\mathrm{u}}(\cdot)] \| \delta_{\mathrm{u}}(\cdot) \|^2 = \delta^2 V[\delta_{\mathrm{u}}(\cdot)] \ge \| \alpha[\delta_{\mathrm{u}}(\cdot)] \| \| \delta_{\mathrm{u}}(\cdot) \|^2$$

for $\|\delta u(\cdot)\|$ sufficiently small. Thus,

$$\Delta V[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] \ge \|\delta_{u}(\cdot)\|^{2} \{ |\alpha[\delta_{u}(\cdot)]| + \alpha[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] \}$$
 (28)

so that

$$\Delta V[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] \ge 0$$
 $\forall \delta_{u}(\cdot) \ni || \delta_{u}(\cdot) || \text{ sufficiently small.}$ (29)

However, (29) is just the definition that $V[u(\cdot)]$ has a weak relative minimum at $\overline{u(\cdot)}$ so that the theorem is proved.

Note. If, as in the nonsingular control problem, the conditions of Theorem 2 are satisfied then clearly so are those of Theorem 3. However, the important point is that Theorem 3 can be satisfied without $\delta^2 V[\delta_u(\cdot)]$ being strongly positive.

2. Principal Results

Before stating our main theorems we make the following assumption and definition.

Assumption 5. The linearized system $\delta \dot{x} = \int_{x}^{\infty} \delta_{x} + \int_{u}^{\infty} \delta_{u}$ is controllable from time t_{0} to time τ , $V\tau \in (t_{0}, t_{f}]$; that is,

$$\int_{t_{O}}^{\tau} \phi(\tau, \sigma) f_{u}(\sigma) f_{u}^{T}(\sigma) \phi^{T}(\tau, \sigma) d\sigma > 0 \quad , \quad \forall \tau \in (t_{O}, t_{f}]$$
(30)

where

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \phi(\tau, \sigma) = f_{\chi}(\tau) \phi(\tau, \sigma) \quad ; \qquad \phi(\sigma, \sigma) = I \tag{31}$$

<u>Definition 4</u>. A real symmetric n x n matrix function of time $\Theta(t)$ is said to be monotone increasing in t if the scalar $J(x,t) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} x^T \Theta(t) x$ is monotone increasing in t for all constant n-vectors x.

Theorem Al.

(i) Necessary Condition. Under Assumptions 1 through 5 a necessary condition for $\delta^2 V[\delta_u(\cdot)] \ge 0$ for all admissible $\delta_u(\cdot)$ is that $\exists Vt \in (t_o, t_f]$ a real symmetric matrix function of time $\mathbf{\hat{P}}(\cdot)$ which is monotone increasing in t such that

$$H_{ux} + f_{u}^{T}P = 0 \qquad \forall t \in (t_{o}, t_{f}]$$
 (32)

$$F_{xx}(t_f) - P(t_f) = -\hat{P}(t_f) \ge 0$$
(33)

where

$$P = Q + \Phi^{T} \hat{P} \Phi \tag{34}$$

$$\dot{\Phi} = -\Phi f_{x}$$
 ; $\Phi(t_{f}) = I$ (35)

and

$$-\dot{Q} = H_{xx} + f_{x}^{T}Q + Qf_{x} ; \qquad Q(t_{f}) = F_{xx}(t_{f})$$
(36)

(ii) Sufficient Condition. In addition to the above stated condition $\mathbf{\hat{P}}(\cdot) \text{ exists Vt } \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \left[\mathbf{t_0}, \mathbf{t_f}\right] \text{ (strengthened existence condition)}.$

Note. The gap between the necessary and the sufficient condition is minimal.

Corollary Al.1. If L_1 and F are quadratic functions of x, if f_1 and L_2 are linear in x, and if f_u is independent of x, then condition (i) of Theorem Al is necessary and together with the strengthened existence condition (ii) of Theorem Al is sufficient for $V[u(\cdot)]$ to have a strong minimum at $\overline{u}(\cdot)$.

Corollary A1.2. [2] A sufficient condition for $\delta^2 V[\delta_u(\cdot)] \ge 0$ for all admissible $\delta_u(\cdot)$ is that $\exists \forall t \in [t_o, t_f]$ a real symmetric matrix function of time $P(\cdot)$ which is continuously differentiable, such that

$$H_{ux} + f_{u}^{T}P = 0 \qquad \forall t \in [t_{o}, t_{f}]$$
(37)

$$\dot{\mathbf{P}} + \mathbf{Pf}_{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{t}) \ge 0 \qquad \forall \mathbf{t} \in [\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{0}}, \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}]$$
 (38)

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) \ge 0 \qquad . \tag{39}$$

<u>Proof.</u> Integration of (38) and the use of (34), (35) and (36) yields $\frac{d}{dt} \hat{P} \triangleq \left[\Phi^{-1}(t)\right]^{T} M(t) \left[\Phi^{-1}(t)\right] \geq 0 \implies \hat{P} \text{ monotone increasing.}$

Note. The gap between this sufficient condition and the sufficient condition of Theorem Al appears to be minimal since \hat{P} is, a priori, differentiable almost everywhere (because it is monotone [14]).

Theorem A2. Sufficient conditions for $V[u(\cdot)]$ to have a weak relative minimum at $\overline{u(\cdot)}$ are that the strengthened condition (ii) of Theorem Al holds and that

$$\delta^2 V[\delta_u(\cdot)] = 0 \implies V[\overline{u}(\cdot) + \delta_u(\cdot)] \ge V[\overline{u}(\cdot)]$$

See Theorem 3 for a condition which ensures this.

3. Useful Lemmas

We need the following Lemmas in order to prove Theorem Al.

Lemma 1. The second variation (13), (14) is expressible in the equivalent canonical form:

$$\delta^{2}V[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] = \delta^{2}\hat{V}[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] \triangleq \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \delta_{u}^{T}C(t)\delta_{y} dt$$
 (40)

subject to

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left(\delta y(t) \right) = B(t) \delta u(t) \qquad ; \qquad \delta y(t_0) = 0 \tag{41}$$

where

$$C(t) = [H_{ux}(t) + f_{u}^{T}(t)Q(t)]\Phi^{-1}(t)$$
 (42)

$$B(t) = \Phi(t)f_{u}(t) \tag{43}$$

$$\dot{\Phi}(t) = -\Phi(t)f_{x}(t) \qquad ; \qquad \Phi(t_{f}) = I \qquad (44)$$

and where

$$-\dot{Q}(t) = H_{xx}(t) + Q(t)f_{x}(t) + f_{x}^{T}(t)Q(t) ; Q(t_{f}) = F_{xx}(\overline{x}(t_{f}))$$
 (45)

$$\delta_{\rm Y}(t) = \Phi(t)\delta_{\rm X}(t) \tag{46}$$

Proof.

(i) (13), $(14) \Longrightarrow (40)$ -(46). Adjoin the linearized system equation (14) to the second variation (13) using a continuously differentiable vector multiplier function of time $\delta\lambda(\cdot)$:

$$\delta^{2} \hat{\nabla} [\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] = \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{f}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{T} \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} + \delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} + \delta_{\mathbf{\lambda}}^{T} (\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}} \delta_{\mathbf{u}} - \delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{x}}) \right\}_{dt}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{T} \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}}^{\delta_{\mathbf{x}}} \Big|_{t_{f}}$$

$$(47)$$

Integrating δλδż by parts yields

$$\delta^{2} \hat{\mathbf{v}}[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] = \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{T} \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} + \delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} + \delta_{\lambda}^{T} (\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}} \delta_{\mathbf{u}}) \right.$$

$$\left. + \delta_{\lambda}^{\dagger} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} \right\}_{dt} + \left. \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{T} \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} \right|_{t_{f}} - \left. \delta_{\lambda}^{T} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} \right]_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} . \tag{48}$$

Now set

$$\delta \lambda(t) = \frac{1}{2} Q(t) \delta_{x}(t) \tag{49}$$

where Q(t) is an n x n symmetric matrix (continuously differentiable) function of time. Noting that $\delta_{\rm X}(t_{_{\rm O}}) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} 0$, the second variation becomes

$$\delta^{2} \hat{\mathbf{v}}[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] = \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{f}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{T} (\dot{\mathbf{Q}} + \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{x}}^{T} \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}}) \delta_{\mathbf{x}} + \delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} (\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} \mathbf{Q}) \delta_{\mathbf{x}} \right\} d\mathbf{t} + \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{T} (\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{Q}) \delta_{\mathbf{x}} \Big|_{t_{f}}.$$

$$(50)$$

Now we let

$$-\dot{Q} = H_{xx} + f_{x}^{T}Q + Qf_{x} ; \quad Q(t_{f}) = F_{xx}(t_{f})$$
 (51)

Clearly $Q(\cdot)$ is a well defined continuously differentiable function of time. With this choice of $Q(\cdot)$ the second variation is

$$\delta^{2} \hat{\mathbf{v}}[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] = \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} (\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} \mathbf{Q}) \delta_{\mathbf{x} \, dt}$$
 (52)

subject to

$$\delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{\star} = f_{\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} + f_{\mathbf{u}} \delta_{\mathbf{u}} \qquad ; \qquad \delta_{\mathbf{x}}(t_{\mathbf{Q}}) = 0$$
 (53)

Define

$$\delta_{\rm Y} = \Phi \delta_{\rm X} \tag{54}$$

where

$$\dot{\Phi} = -\Phi f_{x} \qquad ; \qquad \Phi(t_{f}) = I \qquad . \tag{55}$$

Clearly $\Phi(t)$ is invertible $\forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$ so that the second variation becomes

$$\delta^{2} \hat{\mathbf{v}}[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] = \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} (\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{u}x} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} \mathbf{Q}) \Phi^{-1} \delta_{\mathbf{y}} dt$$
 (56)

subject to

$$\delta \dot{y} = \Phi f_{ij} \delta u$$
 ; $\delta y(t_f) = 0$ (57)

which is the required form of the second variation.

(ii) (40)-(46) \Longrightarrow (13), (14). Since Φ is invertible, (54), (56), (57) yield (52), (53). Adjoin (53) to (52) with a Lagrange multiplier function $\delta \lambda$ (·) and set

$$\delta \widetilde{\lambda}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \widetilde{Q}(t) \delta_{x}(t) \qquad . \tag{58}$$

The second variation becomes

$$\delta^{2}\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] = \int_{\mathbf{t}_{o}}^{\mathbf{t}_{f}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{T} (\widetilde{\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}} + \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{x}}^{T} \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}) \delta_{\mathbf{x}} + \delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} (\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}) \delta_{\mathbf{x}} \right\} d\mathbf{t}$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{T} \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} \Big|_{\mathbf{t}_{f}}$$
(59)

Letting

$$\widetilde{Q}(t) = -Q(t)$$
 $\forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$ (60)

yields

$$\delta^{2}\widetilde{V}\left[\delta_{u}(\cdot)\right] = \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \delta_{x}^{T} H_{xx} \delta_{x} + \delta_{u}^{T} H_{ux} \delta_{x} \right\} dt + \frac{1}{2} \delta_{x}^{T} F_{xx} \delta_{x} \Big|_{t_{f}} (61)$$

so that the Lemma is proved.

Lemma 2. Condition (i) of Theorem Al is equivalent to the existence $\forall t \in (t_0, t_f]$ of a real symmetric monotone increasing matrix function of time $\hat{P}(\cdot)$ such that

$$C + B^{T} \hat{P} = 0$$
 $\forall t \in (t_0, t_f]$ (62)

$$-\mathbf{\hat{P}}(\mathbf{t}_{s}) \geq 0 \tag{63}$$

Proof. Let

$$P = \Phi^{T} \hat{P} \Phi + Q \qquad . \tag{64}$$

Substituting this into (62), (63) yields (32), (33) and vice versa. Note the coordinate independence of conditions (32), (33).

4. A Related Nonsingular Second Variation

Consider the nonsingular quadratic functional

$$\delta^{2} v_{N}[\delta_{u}(\cdot), \epsilon] = \delta^{2} \hat{v}[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \delta_{u}^{T} \delta_{u} dt$$
 (65)

$$= \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \{ \delta_u^T C \delta_y + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \delta_u^T \delta_u \} dt$$
 (66)

where $\epsilon > 0$ is a scalar and

$$\delta_{\dot{y}} = B\delta_{u} \qquad ; \qquad \delta_{y}(t_{o}) = 0 \qquad (67)$$

Lemma 3. If $\delta^2 \hat{v}[\delta_u(\cdot)]$ is nonnegative $\forall \delta_u(\cdot)$ then so is $\delta^2 v_N[\delta_u(\cdot), \epsilon]$ nonnegative. Moreover $\delta^2 v_N[\delta_u(\cdot), \epsilon]$ is positive-definite.

Proof.
$$\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \delta_u^T \delta_u dt > 0 \text{ unless } \delta_u(\cdot) = 0.$$

Theorem 4. [Gelfand and Fomin [11, p. 123], Breakwell and Ho [15]]. If the quadratic functional $\delta^2 \hat{v}[\delta_u(\cdot)]$ is nonnegative then the matrix Riccati differential equation

$$-\dot{\mathbf{S}}_{\epsilon} = -(\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{S}_{\epsilon})^{\mathrm{T}} (\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{S}_{\epsilon}) \epsilon \quad ; \quad \mathbf{S}_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathrm{f}}) = 0$$
 (68)

associated with $\delta^2 V_N[\delta u(\cdot), \epsilon]$ has a solution which exists $\forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$. Proof. By Lemma 3, $\delta^2 V_N[\delta u(\cdot), \epsilon]$ is positive-definite if $\delta^2 \hat{V}[\delta u(\cdot)]$ is nonnegative $V \delta u(\cdot)$; Gelfand and Fomin's theorem for positive-definite functionals then applies.

Note. A special case of (66), (67) is treated in [11]; see [15] for the general case.

Theorem 5. If the matrix Riccati differential equation (68) has a solution which exists in the interval $[\tau, t_f]$; $t_0 \le \tau \le t_f$ then the control function that minimizes

$$\delta^{2} \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{N}}^{\tau} [\delta_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau), \delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot), \epsilon, \tau] \triangleq \int_{\tau}^{t_{\mathbf{f}}} \{ \delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{C} \delta_{\mathbf{y}} + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathbf{T}} \delta_{\mathbf{u}} \}_{dt}$$
 (69)

subject to

$$\delta \dot{y} = B \delta u$$
 ; $\delta y(\tau)$ given (70)

is

$$\delta \mathbf{u}^{O}(t) = -\epsilon [C(t) + \mathbf{B}^{T}(t)S_{\epsilon}(t)]\delta \mathbf{y}(t) \quad ; \quad t \in [\tau, t_{\mathbf{f}}]$$
 (71)

and moreover

$$\min_{\delta u(\cdot)} \delta^{2} v_{N}^{\tau} [\delta y(\tau), \delta u(\cdot), \epsilon, \tau] \triangleq \delta^{2} v^{o} [\delta y(\tau), \epsilon, \tau]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \delta y^{T}(\tau) S_{\epsilon}(\tau) \delta y(\tau) \tag{72}$$

Proof. Substitute (72) into the Bellman equation

$$-\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left\{ \delta^{2} V^{o} [\delta_{y}(t), \epsilon, t] \right\} = \min_{\delta_{u}} [\delta_{u}^{T} C \delta_{y} + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \delta_{u}^{T} \delta_{u} + \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial (\delta_{y})} \delta^{2} V^{o} [\delta_{y}(t), \epsilon, t] \right\}^{T} B \delta_{u}] \quad . \tag{73}$$

Minimizing with respect to δu yields (71) and causes the right hand side of (73) to be quadratic in $\delta y(t)$. Equating coefficients of quadratic terms in (73) yields equation (68) for \dot{S}_{ϵ} . If $S_{\epsilon}(t)$ exists $\forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$ Bellman's equation is valid and the theorem is proved.

Lemma 4. $S_{\epsilon}(\cdot)$ is a continuous function of the parameter ϵ .

<u>Proof.</u> C and B are continuous functions of time in $[t_0, t_f]$ and the right hand side of (68) is analytic in S_{ϵ} and ϵ [Coddington and Levinson [16]].

<u>Lemma 5.</u> $\delta^2 V^0[\delta y(\tau), \epsilon, \tau] = \frac{1}{2} \delta y^T(\tau) S_{\epsilon}(\tau) \delta y(\tau)$ is a monotone decreasing function of ϵ (ϵ increasing); $\tau \in [t_0, t_f]$. Moreover, $S_{\epsilon}(\tau)$ is a monotone decreasing matrix function of ϵ ; $\tau \in [t_0, t_f]$.

<u>Proof.</u> For some arbitrary $\delta_y(\tau)$, τ and ϵ_1 , we have

$$\delta^{2} \mathbf{V}^{0}[\delta_{y}(\tau), \epsilon_{1}, \tau] = \min_{\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)} \int_{\tau}^{t_{f}} \{\delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} \mathbf{C} \delta_{y} + \frac{1}{2\epsilon_{1}} \delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} \delta_{\mathbf{u}}\} dt \quad . \tag{74}$$

Let the control function that minimizes (74) be $\delta u_1^o(\cdot)$ and its associated state path be $\delta y_1^o(\cdot)$. Now for any $\epsilon_2 \ge \epsilon_1$ it is clear that

$$\int_{\tau}^{t_{f}} \{ (\delta u_{1}^{\circ})^{T} C \delta y_{1}^{\circ} + \frac{1}{2\epsilon_{2}} (\delta u_{1}^{\circ})^{T} \delta u_{1}^{\circ} \}_{dt} \leq \int_{\tau}^{t_{f}} \{ (\delta u_{1}^{\circ})^{T} C \delta y_{1}^{\circ} + \frac{1}{2\epsilon_{1}} (\delta u_{1}^{\circ})^{T} \delta u_{1}^{\circ} \}_{dt} \qquad (75)$$

and, by definition

$$\delta^{2} \mathbf{v}^{o}[\delta \mathbf{y}(\tau), \epsilon_{2}, \tau] \leq \int_{\tau}^{t_{f}} \{(\delta \mathbf{u}_{1}^{o})^{T} \mathbf{C} \delta \mathbf{y}_{1}^{o} + \frac{1}{2\epsilon_{2}} (\delta \mathbf{u}_{1}^{o})^{T} \delta \mathbf{u}_{1}^{o}\} dt$$
 (76)

Thus for any $\epsilon_2 \ge \epsilon_1$ we have

$$\delta^{2}V^{o}[\delta y(\tau), \epsilon_{2}, \tau] \leq \delta^{2}V^{o}[\delta y(\tau), \epsilon_{1}, \tau] \qquad (77)$$

Since $\delta y(\tau)$ and τ are arbitrary, the first part of the theorem is proved.

That $S_{\epsilon_2}(\tau) \leq S_{\epsilon_1}(\tau)$, $\tau \in [t_0, t_f]$, $\epsilon_2 \geq \epsilon_1$, follows from (77) and Theorem 5.

<u>Lemma 6</u>. Under Assumptions 1 through 5, if $\delta^2 \hat{V}[\delta_u(\cdot)] \ge 0$ for all admissible $\delta_u(\cdot)$ then $S_{\infty}(t) \triangleq \lim_{\epsilon \to \infty} S_{\epsilon}(t)$ exists $\forall t \in (t_0, t_f]$ and is negative semi-definite.

<u>Proof.</u> From (68) $S_{\epsilon}(\tau) \leq 0 \ \forall \tau \in [t_0, t_f], \ \forall \epsilon; \ 0 < \epsilon < \infty$. By Lemma 5 $S_{\epsilon}(\tau)$ is a monotone decreasing function of ϵ (ϵ increasing) so that it has a limit (possibly $-\infty$).

Given an arbitrary time τ in the interval (t_0, t_f) we can by Assumption 5 construct a variation $\delta u_3(t)$; $t \in [t_0, \tau)$ such that

$$\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \{\delta \mathbf{u}_3^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{C} \delta \mathbf{y}_3 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \delta \mathbf{u}_3^{\mathrm{T}} \delta \mathbf{u}_3 \} dt$$

is finite and such that

$$\delta y_3(\tau) = \gamma(\tau)$$
; $\gamma(\tau)$ arbitrary . (78)

Suppose that $S_{\infty}(\tau) = -\infty$. Then, by Lemmas 4, 5, $S_{\epsilon}(\tau)$ can be made arbitrarily large and negative by increasing ϵ . This implies that for some $\gamma(\tau)$, $\delta^2 V^0[\delta y_3(\tau), \epsilon, \tau]$ can be made arbitrarily large and negative which implies that

$$\int_{t_0}^{\tau} \{\delta \mathbf{u}_3^{\mathrm{T}} C \delta \mathbf{y}_3 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \delta \mathbf{u}_3^{\mathrm{T}} \delta \mathbf{u}_3\} dt + \delta^2 \mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{O}}[\delta \mathbf{y}_3(\tau), \epsilon, \tau] < 0$$
 (79)

for some ϵ ; $0 < \epsilon < \infty$. By Lemma 3 this contradicts the assumption that $\delta^2 \hat{V}[\delta u(.)] \ge 0$ so that $S_{\infty}(\tau)$ cannot be infinite. Since τ is arbitrary, and since $S_{\epsilon}(t_f) = 0$ $\forall \epsilon$, we conclude that

$$S_{CO}(\tau)$$
; $\tau \in (t_O, t_f]$ is finite . (80)

Note. We have not shown that as ϵ becomes large the control $\{\overline{u}(t) + \delta u_3(t), t \in [t_o, \tau); \overline{u}(t) + \delta u^0(t), t \in [\tau, t_f]\} \in U$. However, we have shown that if $S_{\infty}(\cdot)$ is not finite in the interval $(t_o, t_f]$ then $\delta^2 V_N[\delta y(t_o), \delta u(\cdot), \epsilon, t_o]$, ϵ sufficiently large but finite, does not have a minimum at $\delta u(\cdot) = 0$. Since for the quadratic functional there is no distinction between a weak and a strong minimum it follows that $\delta^2 V_N[\delta y(t_o), \delta u(\cdot), \epsilon, t_o]$ can be made negative by a weak variation which satisfies $\overline{u}(\cdot) + \delta u(\cdot) \epsilon U$. We conclude, then, that the Lemma is proved.

Lemma 7. $S_{\infty}(\tau)$ is a monotone increasing matrix function of τ . Proof. From (68)

$$S_{\infty}(\tau) = \lim_{\epsilon \to \infty} \left[\int_{t_0}^{\tau} (C + B^{T} S_{\epsilon})^{T} (C + B^{T} S_{\epsilon}) \epsilon dt \right]$$
 (81)

$$= \lim_{\epsilon \to \infty} \left[\int_{t_0}^{\tau - \Delta} (C + B^T S_{\epsilon})^T (C + B^T S_{\epsilon}) \epsilon dt \right]$$

$$+ \lim_{\epsilon \to \infty} \left[\int_{T^{-\Delta}}^{T} (C + B^{T} S_{\epsilon})^{T} (C + B^{T} S_{\epsilon}) \epsilon dt \right]$$
 (82)

From (82)

$$S_{\infty}(\tau) = S_{\infty}(\tau - \Delta) + \lim_{\epsilon \to \infty} \left[\int_{\tau - \Delta}^{\tau} (C + B^{T}S_{\epsilon})^{T}(C + B^{T}S_{\epsilon}) \epsilon dt \right]. \quad (83)$$

The validity of the Lemma follows immediately from (83) since for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\left[\int_{\tau-\Delta}^{\tau} (C + B^{T} S_{\epsilon})^{T} (C + B^{T} S_{\epsilon}) \epsilon dt\right] \ge 0 \qquad \forall \Delta \ge 0 \quad . \tag{84}$$

<u>Lemma 8</u>. If $S_{\infty}(\tau)$ exists for $\tau \in (t_0, t_f]$ then

$$C(\tau) + B^{T}(\tau)S_{\infty}(\tau) = 0$$
 a.e. in $[t_{o}, t_{f}]$ (85)

<u>Proof.</u> Suppose the contrary. Then, for some $\tau \in (t_0, t_f)$, by Assumption 2 and Lemma 4, $\exists \epsilon^* > 0$

$$-\int_{t_{f}}^{\tau} (C + B^{T} S_{\epsilon})^{T} (C + B^{T} S_{\epsilon}) dt > 0, \qquad \forall \epsilon \geq \epsilon^{*}$$
(86)

so that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to \infty} \left[-\int_{t_{f}}^{\tau} (C + B^{T} S_{\epsilon})^{T} (C + B^{T} S_{\epsilon}) \epsilon dt \right] = \infty$$
 (87)

contradicting the fact that $S_{\infty}(\tau)$ exists for $\tau \in (t_{0}, t_{f}]$.

5. Proof of Theorem Al.

(i) Necessary Condition. If Assumptions 1 through 5 are satisfied and if $\delta^2 \hat{\mathbf{v}}[\delta_u(\cdot)] \ge 0$ for all admissible $\delta_u(\cdot)$, then by Lemmas 6-8 $\exists \mathbf{S}_{\infty}(t)$; $t \in (t_0, t_f]$ which is a real symmetric monotone increasing matrix function of time such that

$$C + BTSOC = 0 a.e. in [tO, tf] (88)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{\infty}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) = 0 \qquad . \tag{89}$$

We show now that (88), (89) imply (62), (63) which by Lemma 2 yield the conditions of Theorem A1.

Define

$$\mathbf{\hat{P}}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) = \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{\infty}}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}^{-}) \tag{90}$$

Since by Lemma 7, $S_{\infty}(t)$ is a monotone increasing function of t it follows that

$$-\mathbf{\hat{P}}(\mathbf{t_f}) \ge 0 \tag{91}$$

Defining

$$\mathbf{\hat{P}}(t) = \mathbf{S}_{\infty}(t) \quad , \quad t \in (t_{0}, t_{f})$$
 (92)

yields

$$C + B^{T} \hat{P} = 0$$
 a.e. in $[t_{o}, t_{f}]$ (93)

where

$$\mathbf{\hat{P}}(t)$$
 exists $\forall t \in (t_0, t_f]$ (94)

and is monotone increasing in t. In order to establish necessity of (62) we need only show that (93) implies

$$C + B^{T} \hat{P} = 0 \qquad \forall t \in (t_{o}, t_{f}]$$
 (95)

Suppose that for some $t \in (t_0, t_f)$

$$C(t) + B^{T}(t)\hat{P}(t) \neq 0 \qquad . \tag{96}$$

Since C and B are continuous functions of time (96) can only occur if a jump in \hat{P} occurs at time t that does not lie in the null space of $B^T(t)$.

Moreover, since \hat{P} is monotone increasing in t it follows from (96) that

$$C(t)B(t) + B^{T}(t)\hat{P}(t)B(t) > 0$$
 (97)

Now since \hat{P} is monotone increasing in t, and C and B are continuous functions of time, (97) must hold during the time interval $[t, t + \Delta]$ ($\Delta > 0$ and sufficiently small), contradicting (93). Thus, we are led to the conclusion that

$$C + B^{T} \hat{P} = 0 \qquad \forall t \in (t_o, t_f) \qquad (98)$$

Equation (95) follows from (98) since $\hat{P}(t_f) \equiv \hat{P}(t_f)$.

(ii) <u>Sufficient Condition</u>. Suppose that (91) and (95) are satisfied and that (94) is satisfied in strengthened form (i.e. $\hat{P}(t)$ exists $\forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$).

Adjoin the linearized dynamics to the second variation as follows:

$$\delta^{2} \widehat{\mathbf{v}}[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] = \delta^{2} \widehat{\mathbf{v}}[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] \triangleq \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \{\delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} \mathbf{C} \delta_{\mathbf{y}} + \delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{T} \widehat{\mathbf{P}}(\mathbf{B} \delta_{\mathbf{u}} - \delta \dot{\mathbf{y}})\} dt \quad (99)$$

$$= \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \delta_u^{\mathrm{T}} (C + B^{\mathrm{T}} \hat{P}) \delta_{\mathrm{ydt}} - \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \delta_y^{\mathrm{T}} \hat{P} \delta_{\mathrm{ydt}} .$$
(100)

The first integral is zero since (95) holds. The remaining integral can be written in Stieltjies form as

$$-\int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \delta_{y}^{T} \mathbf{\hat{P}} d(\delta_{y})$$
 (101)

which, upon integration by parts [14, p. 118] becomes

$$\int_{t_{0}}^{t_{f}} \frac{1}{2} \delta_{y}^{T} d\hat{P}(t) \delta_{y} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{y}^{T} \hat{P} \delta_{y} \Big]_{t_{0}}^{t_{f}}$$
(102)

Thus

$$\delta^{2}\widetilde{\mathbf{V}}\left[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)\right] = \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{T} d\mathbf{\hat{P}}(t) \delta_{\mathbf{y}} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{T} \mathbf{\hat{P}} \delta_{\mathbf{y}} \Big|_{t_{f}}$$
(103)

since $\delta y(t_0) = 0$. From (91) the term evaluated at t_f is nonnegative, and the integral is nonnegative since $\hat{P}(\cdot)$ is a monotone increasing matrix function of time. Sufficiency is proved.

III. Conditions for a Relative Minimum: Constrained Terminal State

1. The Second Variation $\delta^2 V^*$

Here we treat the class of totally singular problems where equality (4) is present. In this case the second variation (for $\delta u(t)$ sufficiently small, $t \in [t_0, t_f]$) has the form

$$\delta^{2}V^{*}[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] = \int_{t_{0}}^{t_{f}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \delta_{x}^{T} H_{xx} \delta_{x} + \delta_{u}^{T} H_{ux} \delta_{x} \right\} dt$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \delta_{x}^{T} (F_{xx} + v^{T} \psi_{xx}) \delta_{x} \Big|_{t_{f}}$$

$$(104)$$

subject to the linearized differential equation

$$\delta_{\dot{\mathbf{x}}} = f_{\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} + f_{\mathbf{u}} \delta_{\mathbf{u}} \quad ; \qquad \delta_{\mathbf{x}}(t_{\mathbf{o}}) = 0 \tag{105}$$

and the linearized terminal constraint

$$\psi_{\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{x}} \Big|_{\mathbf{t_f}} = 0 \qquad . \tag{106}$$

We now introduce

Assumption 6. The s x n matrix $\psi_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}(t_f))$ has full rank s.

<u>Lemma 9</u>. By Assumption 6, s components of $\delta_{x}(t_{f})$ -- referred to as $\delta_{x}^{s}(t_{f})$ -- can be solved for in terms of the remaining n - s components $\delta_{x}^{n-s}(t_{f})$.

For example,

$$\delta_{x}^{s}(t_{f}) = -A_{1}^{-1}A_{2}\delta_{x}^{n-s}(t_{f})$$
 (108)

where+

$$\mathbf{s} \uparrow \left[\begin{array}{c|c} & \mathbf{n} \\ A_1 & A_2 \end{array} \right] = \psi_{\mathbf{x}} \tag{109}$$

so that

$$\delta_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{A}_{1}^{-1}\mathbf{A}_{2}\delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{n-s}}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) \\ ----- \\ \delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{n-s}}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbf{A}_{1}^{-1}\mathbf{A}_{2} \\ ---- \\ \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{n-s}}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) \triangleq Z\delta_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{n-s}}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}})$$
(110)

where Z is $n \times (n - s)$.

 $⁺_{\rm If} A_1$ is singular then differently partitioned $\psi_{\rm x}$ and $\delta_{\rm x}(t_{\rm f})$ must be used.

2. Principal Results

Theorem B1.

(i) Necessary Condition. Under Assumptions 1 through 6 a necessary condition for $\delta^2 V*[\delta u(\cdot)] \ge 0$ for all admissible $\delta u(\cdot)$ is that $\exists Vt \in (t_0, t_f)$ a real symmetric matrix function of time $\hat{P}^*(\cdot)$ which is monotone increasing in t such that

$$H_{ux} + f_{u}^{T} P^{*} = 0 \qquad \forall t \in (t_{o}, t_{f})$$
 (111)

$$Z^{T}(F_{xx} + \nu^{T}\psi_{xx} - P^{*}(t_{f}))Z = -Z^{T}\hat{P}^{*}(t_{f})Z \ge 0$$
 (112)

where

$$P^* = Q + \Phi^{T} \hat{P}^* \Phi \quad , \tag{113}$$

$$\dot{\Phi} = -\Phi f_{x} \qquad ; \qquad \Phi(t_{f}) = I \qquad (114)$$

$$-\dot{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{H}_{xx} + \mathbf{f}_{x}^{T} \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{f}_{x} \quad ; \quad \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{t}_{f}) = \mathbf{F}_{xx} + \mathbf{v}^{T} \boldsymbol{\psi}_{xx}$$
 (115)

and where Z is defined in (110).

(ii) <u>Sufficient Condition</u>. In addition to the above stated condition $\hat{P}^*(t)$ exists $\forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$ and

$$Z^{T}(\mathbf{F}_{xx} + v^{T}\psi_{xx} - \mathbf{P}^{*})Z\Big|_{\mathbf{t}_{f}} \ge 0$$

Corollary Bl.1. If L_1 and F are quadratic functions of x, if f_1 and L_2 are linear in x, if f_u is independent of x and if ψ is linear in $x(t_f)$ then condition (i) of Theorem Bl is necessary, and together with the strengthened existence condition (ii) of Theorem Bl is sufficient, for $V[u(\cdot)]$ to have a strong minimum at $\overline{u}(\cdot)$.

Corollary B1.2. [2] A sufficient condition for $\delta^2 V^*[\delta u(\cdot)] \ge 0$ is that $\exists \forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$ a real, symmetric, continuously differentiable matrix function of time $P^*(\cdot)$ such that

$$H_{ux} + f_{u}^{T}P^{*} = 0 \qquad \forall t \in [t_{o}, t_{f}]$$
 (116)

$$\dot{P}^* + P^* f_x + f_x^T P^* + H_{xx} = M'(t) \ge 0$$
, $\forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$ (117)

$$Z^{T}(\mathbf{F}_{xx} + \nu^{T} \psi_{xx} - \mathbf{P}^{*})Z\Big|_{\mathbf{t}_{f}} \ge 0$$
 (118)

3. Useful Lemmas

Lemma 10. The second variation (104)-(106) is expressible in the equivalent canonical form

$$\delta^{2} V^{*}[\delta u(\cdot)] = \delta^{2} \hat{V}^{*}[\delta u(\cdot)] \triangleq \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \delta u^{T} C \delta_{y} dt$$
 (119)

subject to

$$\delta \dot{y} = B \delta u$$
 ; $\delta y(t_0) = 0$ (120)

and

$$\psi_{\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{y}} \Big|_{\mathbf{t_f}} = 0 \tag{121}$$

where C and B are given by (42), (43).

<u>Proof.</u> See Lemma 1. In addition we have (121) which follows from the fact that $\Phi(t_f) = I$, see (44).

Lemma 11. Condition (i) of Theorem B1 is equivalent to the existence $\forall t \in (t_0, t_f)$ of a real symmetric monotone increasing matrix function of time $\hat{P}^*(\cdot)$ such that

$$C + B^{T} \hat{P}^* = 0 \qquad \forall t \in (t_0, t_f)$$
 (122)

$$-Z^{\mathrm{T}} \hat{\mathbf{p}} * (\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) Z \ge 0 \tag{123}$$

Proof. See Lemma 2.

4. A Related Nonsingular Second Variation

Consider the nonsingular variational problem

$$\delta^{2}V_{N}^{*}[\delta_{u}(\cdot), \epsilon] = \delta^{2}\hat{V}^{*}[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \delta_{u}^{T} \delta_{u} dt$$
 (124)

$$= \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \{ \delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{C} \delta_{\mathbf{y}} + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathrm{T}} \delta_{\mathbf{u}} \} dt$$
 (125)

subject to

$$\delta \dot{y} = B \delta u$$
 ; $\delta y(t_0) = 0$ (126)

and the linearized terminal constraint

$$\psi_{\mathbf{x}} \delta_{\mathbf{y}} \Big|_{\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}} = 0 \qquad . \tag{127}$$

Theorem 6. [Gelfand and Fomin [11, p. 123], Breakwell and Ho [15]]. If the quadratic functional $\delta^2 \hat{V}^*[\delta u(\cdot)]$ is nonnegative then the matrix Riccati differential equation

$$-\dot{\mathbf{S}}_{\epsilon} = -(\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{B}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{S}_{\epsilon})^{\mathsf{T}} (\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{B}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{S}_{\epsilon}) \epsilon$$
 (128)

associated with $\delta^2 V_N^*[\delta_u(\cdot),\epsilon]$ has a solution $S_{\epsilon}(t)$ which exists

Vt ϵ [t_o,t_f). In a neighborhood of t_f, S_{ϵ} is given by [17]

$$S_{\epsilon}(t) = W_{\epsilon}(t) - N_{\epsilon}(t)M_{\epsilon}^{-1}(t)N_{\epsilon}^{T}(t)$$
(129)

where

$$\dot{\mathbf{w}}_{\epsilon} = -(\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{w}_{\epsilon})^{\mathrm{T}} (\mathbf{C} + \mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{w}_{\epsilon}) \epsilon \quad ; \quad \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) = 0$$
 (130)

$$\dot{\mathbf{M}}_{\epsilon} = \mathbf{N}_{\epsilon}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{B}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{N}_{\epsilon} \epsilon \qquad ; \quad \mathbf{M}_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathrm{f}}) = 0 \qquad (131)$$

and

$$\dot{N}_{\epsilon} = (C + B^{T}W_{\epsilon})^{T}B^{T}N_{\epsilon}\epsilon \qquad ; \qquad N_{\epsilon}(t_{f}) = \psi_{x}^{T} . \qquad (132)$$

Note that $M_{\epsilon}(t)$, $t < t_f$, is invertible by Assumption 3.

Theorem 7. If the matrix Riccati differential equation (128) has a solution $S_{\epsilon}(\tau)$ which exists for all $\tau \in [t_0, t_f)$ then

$$\min_{\substack{\delta \\ \delta u(\cdot)}} \delta^2 v_N^* \tau [\delta y(\tau), \delta u(\cdot), \epsilon, \tau] \triangleq \delta^2 v^* \sigma [\delta y(\tau), \epsilon, \tau]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \delta_{y}^{T}(\tau) S_{\epsilon}(\tau) \delta_{y}(\tau)$$
 (133)

Proof. See [17, p. 183-184].

Lemma 12. $S_{\infty}(t) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \lim_{\epsilon \to \infty} S_{\epsilon}(t)$ exists $\forall t \in (t_0, t_f)$ and is a real symmetric monotone increasing matrix function of time such that

$$C + BTS\infty = 0 a.e. in [to, tf] (134)$$

<u>Proof.</u> The proof is very similar to the proof of Lemmas 4-8 and so is not described here.

$$\underline{\text{Lemma 13}}. \quad \underline{\text{Lim}} \quad \underline{\text{Lim}} \quad Z^{T} S_{\epsilon}(t) Z = Z^{T} S_{\infty}(t_{f}) Z = 0 \tag{135}$$

where Z is defined in (110).

Proof. We have

$$S_{\epsilon}(t) = W_{\epsilon}(t) - N_{\epsilon}(t)M_{\epsilon}^{-1}(t)N_{\epsilon}^{T}(t)$$
 (136)

Since N_{ϵ} obeys a linear homogeneous differential equation we have

$$S_{\epsilon}(t) = W_{\epsilon}(t) - \psi_{x}^{T} \theta_{\epsilon}^{T}(t) M_{\epsilon}^{-1}(t) \theta_{\epsilon}(t) \psi_{x}$$
 (137)

where

$$\dot{\theta}_{\epsilon} = (C + B^{T} W_{\epsilon})^{T} B^{T} \theta_{\epsilon} \epsilon \quad ; \qquad \theta_{\epsilon}(t_{f}) = I$$
 (138)

From (110), (137) it is clear that

$$Z^{T}S_{\epsilon}(t)Z = Z^{T}W_{\epsilon}(t)Z \tag{139}$$

because

$$\psi_{_{\mathbf{X}}}Z = 0 \tag{140}$$

Thus, from (139),

$$Z^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{S}_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) Z = Z^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{W}_{\mathfrak{M}}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) Z = 0$$
 (141)

since

$$W_{\epsilon}(t_{f}) = 0, \ \forall \epsilon \tag{142}$$

Lemma 14.

$$Z^{T}S_{\infty}(t_{f})Z \leq 0 \qquad . \tag{143}$$

<u>Proof.</u> From Lemma 12 $S_{\infty}(t)$ is monotone increasing. Lemma 14 then follows from Lemma 13.

5. Proof of Theorem Bl.

(i) Necessary Condition. If Assumptions 1 through 7 are satisfied and if $\delta^2 \hat{V}$ $[\delta u(\cdot)] \ge 0$ for all admissible $\delta u(\cdot)$ then by Lemmas 12-14 $\exists \forall t \in (t_0, t_f)$ a real symmetric monotone increasing matrix function of time such that

$$C + B^{T}S_{\infty} = 0$$
 a.e. $in[t_{o}, t_{f}]$ (144)

$$\mathbf{Z}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{S}_{\infty}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}^{\mathsf{T}})\mathbf{Z} \leq 0 \tag{145}$$

Defining

$$\mathbf{\hat{P}}^*(t) = \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{C}}(t) , \qquad t \in (t_0, t_f)$$
 (146)

yields

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}}^*(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) = \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}) \tag{147}$$

and

$$C + B^{T} \hat{P}^* = 0$$
 a.e. in $[t_0, t_f]$, (148)

$$Z^{\mathsf{T}}\hat{\mathbf{p}}^*(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{f}})Z \leq 0 \qquad . \tag{149}$$

Using the same argument on (148) as was used in Section II. 5 on equation (93) shows that (148), (149) imply (122), (123) which by Lemma 11 imply the necessary conditions of Theorem B1.

(ii) Sufficient Condition. Suppose that (122) is satisfied by a $\mathbf{\hat{P}}^*(t)$ which exists $\forall t \in [t_o, t_f]$ (strengthened existence condition) such that $-\mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{\hat{P}}^* \mathbf{Z} \Big|_{t_f} \ge 0.$

Adjoin the linearized dynamics to the canonical second variation as follows

$$\delta^{2} \hat{\mathbf{v}}^{*}[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] = \delta^{2} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^{*}[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] \triangleq \int_{t_{O}}^{t_{f}} \{\delta_{\mathbf{u}}^{T} \mathbf{C} \delta_{\mathbf{y}} + \delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{T} \hat{\mathbf{P}}^{*}(\mathbf{B} \delta_{\mathbf{u}} - \delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{*})\} dt$$
(150)

$$= -\int_{t_{0}}^{t_{f}} \delta_{y}^{T} \hat{\mathbf{p}} * \delta_{y}^{*} dt$$
 (151)

because of (122). Integrating (151) by parts yields

$$\delta^{2} \hat{\mathbf{v}}^{*}[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] = \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{T} d\hat{\mathbf{P}}^{*}(t) \delta_{\mathbf{y}} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{T} \hat{\mathbf{P}}^{*} \delta_{\mathbf{y}} \Big|_{t_{f}}$$
(152)

where the integral is in the Stieltjies sense.

Using (110) and the fact that $\delta_x(t_f) = \delta_y(t_f)$ yields

$$\delta^{2}\mathbf{\hat{v}}^{*}[\delta_{\mathbf{u}}(\cdot)] = \int_{t_{o}}^{t_{f}} \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{T} d\mathbf{\hat{P}}^{*}(t)\delta_{\mathbf{y}} - \frac{1}{2}[\delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{n-s}]^{T} \mathbf{z}^{T}\mathbf{\hat{P}}^{*} \mathbf{z}[\delta_{\mathbf{y}}^{n-s}]\Big|_{t_{f}} (153)$$

Since $\mathbf{\hat{P}}^*(t)$ is monotone increasing the integral is nonnegative and since $-\mathbf{Z}^T\mathbf{\hat{P}}^*\mathbf{Z}\Big|_{\mathbf{t_f}} \ge 0$ the boundary term is nonnegative. This concludes the

sufficiency proof.

Note. This sufficient condition for the constrained terminal state problem may appear to be stringent because a $\mathbf{\hat{P}}^*(t_f)$ is required to exist, but $\mathbf{S}_{\infty}(t_f)$ is undefined. However, as in the free terminal state case it is the authors' opinion that the gap between the necessary and the sufficient condition is minimal. This is supported by the following (slightly altered) sufficiency theorem due to Brockett [18, p. 140] (a proof of necessity of this theorem is not given in [18] but appears to be straightforward).

Theorem 7. [c.f. Theorem 6]. If there exists a symmetric boundary condition $S_{\epsilon}(t_f)$ such that the solution of (128) exists $\forall t \in [t_o, t_f]$ then $\delta^2 V_N^*[\delta u(\cdot), \epsilon]$ is positive-definite. \dagger

Of course the solution of (128) with finite boundary condition is not the same as the weighting matrix (136) of the quadratic optimal value function. This is consistent with the fact that $\hat{P}^*(t_f)$ in our sufficient condition cannot be identified with $S_{\infty}(t_f)$; i.e., in our sufficient condition for the fixed terminal state problem we lose the identification of $\hat{P}^*(\cdot)$ being the limit of the weighting matrix of the quadratic optimal value function as $\epsilon \to \infty$.

IV. Relation to Existing Necessary Conditions of Optimality

Known necessary conditions for singular problems can be deduced from our theorems. Here we give the most important ones.

Theorem C1. [Robbins [7], Goh [10]]. Under Assumptions 1 through 5 a necessary condition for $V[u(\cdot)]$ to have a minimum at $u(\cdot)$ is that $H_{ux} u$ be symmetric for all $t \in [t_o, t_f]$.

Proof. From (32)

$$H_{u \times u}^{f} + f_{u}^{T} P f_{u} = 0 \qquad \forall t \in (t_{o}, t_{f}]$$
(154)

Since P is symmetric it follows that $H_{ux}f_u$ is symmetric in $(t_o, t_f]$.

Assumption 2 implies that indeed $H_{ux}f_u$ is symmetric in $[t_o, t_f]$.

Theorem C2. [Jacobson [1]]. Under Assumptions 1 through 5 a necessary condition for $V[u(\cdot)]$ to have a minimum (unconstrained terminal state case) at $\overline{u}(\cdot)$ is that

$$(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{Q})\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}} \ge 0 \qquad \forall \mathbf{t} \in [\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{o}}, \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}]$$
 (155)

where Q satisfies (36).

⁺Brockett treats the case where ψ_{x} = I.

Proof. From (32) and (34)

$$H_{ux}f_{u} + f_{u}^{T}Qf_{u} + f_{u}^{T}\Phi^{T}\mathbf{\hat{P}}\Phi f_{u} = 0 \qquad \forall t \in (t_{o}, t_{f}]$$
(156)

Since $\hat{P}(t) \leq 0 \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t_f]$ it follows from (156) that

$$(H_{ux} + f_{u}^{T}Q)f_{u} \ge 0 \qquad \forall t \in (t_{o}, t_{f}]$$
(157)

Since H_{ux} , f_u , Q are continuous in time (155) follows.

Theorem C3. [Kelley [6], Robbins [7] generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition]. Under Assumptions 1 through 5 a necessary condition for $V[u(\cdot)]$ to have a minimum at $\overline{u}(\cdot)$ is that

$$(-1)\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\ddot{H}_{u}^{2} \ge 0 \qquad \text{Vt } \epsilon \left[t_{o}, t_{f}\right]$$
 (158)

<u>Proof.</u> From (32), and post multiplying by f_u, we obtain

$$[(\dot{H}_{ux} + \dot{f}_{u}^{T}P)f_{u} + (H_{ux} + f_{u}^{T}P)\dot{f}_{u}]dt + f_{u}^{T}dPf_{u} = 0$$
(159)

where, from (34)-(36)

$$d\hat{P} = (-H_{xx} - f_{x}^{T}P - Pf_{x})dt + \Phi^{T}d\hat{P}\Phi$$
 (160)

Using (32) and (160) in (159) yields

$$(\dot{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{x}}\dot{\mathbf{f}}_{\mathbf{u}} - \dot{\mathbf{f}}_{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{x}}\dot{\mathbf{f}}_{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{u}}^{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{u}}$$

$$+ H_{ux} f_{x} f_{u} dt = -f_{u}^{T} \Phi^{T} d\hat{P} \Phi f_{u}$$
 (161)

The left hand side of (161) is just $(\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\ddot{H}_u)dt$. Since \hat{P} is monotone increasing in t we obtain from (161)

$$(-1)\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\ddot{H}_{u} \ge 0 \qquad \qquad Vt \in (t_{o}, t_{f})$$
 (162)

By the assumed continuity of $\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\ddot{H}_{u}$ (162) implies

$$(-1)\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\ddot{H}_{u} \ge 0 \qquad \qquad \forall t \in [t_{O}, t_{f}]$$
 (163)

Here dP is the increment in P in time dt.

Note. If H_{xx}, f_x, f_u, H_{ux} are assumed smooth in t then the general form of the generalized Legendre-Clebsch condition can be deduced in the manner outlined above

$$(-1)^{p} \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \left[\frac{d^{2p}}{dt^{2p}} H_{u} \right] \ge 0 \tag{164}$$

V. Relation to Generalized Jacobi (Riccati equation) Necessary Condition

In [5] Kelley's transformation technique is used to transform the singular second variation into a nonsingular one in a reduced state space. A condition for this to succeed is that (163) be satisfied with strict inequality. It is then shown that the Riccati differential equation associated with this nonsingular problem implies the conditions of Corollary A1.2 i.e., these conditions are necessary as well as sufficient for a large class of problems. (It should be possible to prove this via our limit approach; one would only have to show that $S_{\infty}(t)$ is continuously differentiable with respect to t, $t \in (t_{0}, t_{f})$.)

In [5] sufficient conditions are given to ensure that Theorem A2 holds. We state one set of these conditions here;

Theorem D1. If the conditions of Corollary A1.2 are satisfied then the following are sufficient to ensure that

$$\delta^{2}V[\delta_{u}(\cdot)] \geq 0 \implies V[\overline{u}(\cdot) + \delta_{u}(\cdot)] \geq V[\overline{u}(\cdot)]$$
(165)

a) Strengthened Generalized Legendre-Clebsch Condition

$$-\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\ddot{H}_{u} > 0 \qquad \forall t \in [t_{o}, t_{f}]$$
 (166)

b) Strengthened Jacobson Condition at the Terminal Time

$$\left(\mathbf{H}_{ux} + \mathbf{f}_{u}^{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{F}_{xx}\right) \mathbf{f}_{u} \Big|_{\mathbf{t}_{f}} > 0 \tag{167}$$

In fact (166), (167) together with the conditions of Corollary A1.2 are sufficient to ensure that the <u>transformed second variation</u> is strongly positive with respect to the control variable in the transformed space.

VI. Conclusion

Necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality for singular control problems are obtained by studying the limiting behavior of a nonsingular second variation. This nonsingular second variation is constructed in such a way that it tends to the singular second variation as a parameter approaches infinity. Optimality conditions for both unconstrained and constrained terminal-state problems are obtained.

The optimality conditions derived in this paper are very similar to certain sufficient conditions of Jacobson [2].

In a companion paper [5] it is shown that Jacobson's sufficient conditions are also necessary for a large class of singular optimal control problems; moreover, satisfaction of these conditions is shown to be equivalent to the existence of a solution of a certain matrix Riccati differential equation.

The closing sections of the present paper relate the necessary and sufficient conditions to known necessary conditions. In particular the important necessary conditions of Robbins [7], Goh [8], Kelley et al. [6] and Jacobson [1] follow easily from these new results.

Control problem examples which illustrate the use of these conditions are given in [2].

Acknowledgements

D. H. Jacobson wishes to thank D. G. M. Anderson for useful discussions.

		₹
		·
		4.9
		مود

References

- [1] Jacobson, D. H., A New Necessary Condition of Optimality for Singular Control Problems, J. SIAM Control, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1969.
- [2] Jacobson, D. H., Sufficient Conditions for Non-Negativity of the Second Variation in Singular and Nonsingular Control Problems, Technical Report 596, Division of Engineering and Applied Physics, Harvard University, August 1969; J. SIAM Control, to appear, 1970.
- [3] Jacobson, D. H., New Conditions for Boundedness of the Solution of a Matrix Riccati Differential Equation, J. Diff. Eqns., to appear, 1970.
- [4] Jacobson, D. H., Gershwin, S. B., Lele, M. M., Computation of Optimal Singular Controls, IEEE Trans. Automatic Control, February 1970, to appear.
- [5] Speyer, J. L., and Jacobson, D. H., Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Optimality for Singular Control Problems; A Transformation Approach, J. Math. Anal. Appl., to appear.
- [6] Kelley, H. J., Kopp, R. E., Moyer, H. G., Singular Extremals, Topics in Optimization (G. Leitmann, ed.) Academic Press, 1967.
- [7] Robbins, H. M., A Generalized Legendre-Clebsch Condition for the Singular Cases of Optimal Control, IBM Federal Systems Division Owego, New York, Report No. 66-825, p. 2043, 1966.
- [8] Goh, B. S., A Theory of the Second Variation in Optimal Control, Division of Applied Mechanics, Univ. of California, Berkeley, January 1970.
- [9] McDanell, J. P., and Powers, W. F., New Jacobi-Type Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Restricted Classes of Singular Optimization Problems, University of Michigan, Report No. 02677-1-T, October 1969.
- [10] Goh, B. S., The Second Variation for the Singular Bolza Problem, J. SIAM Control, 4, pp. 309-325, 1966.
- [11] Gelfand, I. M., and Fomin, S. V., Calculus of Variations, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1963.
- [12] Tait, K. S., Singular Problems in Optimal Control, Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University, 1965.
- [13] Johansen, D. E., Convergence Properties of the Method of Gradients, Advances in Control Systems (C. T. Leondes ed.) Vol. 4, Academic Press, New York, 1966.

- [14] Riesz, F., and Sz.-Nagy, B., Functional Analysis (Translated by L. F. Boron), Ungar, New York, 1955.
- [15] Breakwell, J. V., and Ho, Y. C., On the Conjugate Point Condition for the Control Problem, Int. J. Engng. Sci., Vol. 2, pp. 565-579, 1965.
- [16] Coddington, E. A., and Levinson, N., Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations, McGraw Hill, New York, 1955.
- [17] Bryson, A. E., and Ho, Y. C., Applied Optimal Control, Blaisdell Waltham, 1969.
- [18] Brockett, R. W., Finite Dimensional Linear Systems, Wiley, New York, April 1970.

A. ademy Library (DFSLR) U. S. Arr Fore A. ademy Coloredo Suringa, Coloredo 50840 Hq. ARRC (ARYS) Attn. Library/Documents Arould AFS, Iron 27584 Arronaulis e Library Graduate Aaronauts al Letteraturire California finishile of Fechnology 1201 E California Bled Pasadena, California 41169 Agrospece Corporation
P. O. Bux 45085
Los Angeles, California 90045
Attn: Library Acquisitions Group Airborne Instruments Laboratory Deerpark, New York 11729 AFAL (AVTA/R D Lereun) Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio 45411 AFCRL (CRMPLR) AFCRL Research Library, Stop 24 L. G. Hanes om Freid Bedford, Mass. 01731 ADTC (ADRPS-12) Egiin Air Force Bose Florida 12542 ADTC (ADBPS-12) Egits AFB Florida 12542 AULIT-9661 Maxwell AFB Alabama 16112

AFETR Technical Library (ETV, MU-134) Patrick AFR, Florida 34944 Atmospheric Sciences Ottor Atmospheric Sciences Laboratory White Sends Missile Range New Mr. on REDOZ Gase Sestitute of Technology Engineering Division University Circle Cleveland, Chos. 4410b Communiting Officer Naval Wespenn Conter Geroen Laboratories Atta: Library Corone, California 91720 Commander U. S. Maval Missile Conter Point Muga, Galifornia 13041 Deputy for Recentsh and Engineering [AASSWS-DER] U. S. Army Weapone Command Rock Island Attendal Styck Island, Illinois 61201 Hollander Associates P. O. Ben 2276 Pullerten, Galifernia 92633 Carnego institute of Technology Electrical Engineering Dept Pittsburg, Pa 15213 Central Intelligence Agency Atta: OCR/DD Publications Washington, D. C. 20505 Dr. G. M. Janney, AMEEL-HL-NVOR Hight Victor Laboratory, USAECOM Part Belveix, Virginia, 22000 Biroctor, Electronic Programs Department of the Navy Washington, D. C. 20360 Attn: Code 427 (1) Commandant
U. S. Army and General Staff College
Atte: Sequentians, Ltb. Div.
Fort Leavenworth, Kanzas 66370 Technical Structor (ShiUFA-AJ000-107-1) Frankford Arzonal Philadelphia, Ph. 18127 Commandant U. S. Army Air Defense School Arm: Missile Sciences Dv. C & S Dept. P. O. Box 9390 Fart Bliss, Texas 79915 U. S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development Center Arts: Technical Document Center, 2htg. 115 Teor Bobeler, Virginia 23068 Commanding General Acta: STEWS-RE-L, Sechaical Library White Sandy Missile Range New Mexico 5502 (2) Commanting General U. S. Army Electronics Command Fort Mommouth, New Jersey 07703 Commanding General U. S. Army Material Command Alts: AMCRD-TP Washington, D. C. 20315

Mg. 2000 (20071) L. G. Hanscom Field Bedford, Mans. 01731 (2) Dr. H. Harrison, Code RRE Chief, Electrophysics Branch NASA Washington, D. C. 20146

Communiting Courts:

U. B. Army Minnie Communit

Allin: Technical Library ANNALISEA

Reference Arsensi, Alabama, 1980; Commanding Utilicer Naval Avionica Facility Indianapolis, Indiana 46241

White Oak, Maryland 21902 (2) Gunnamber (Code 793) Neval Wangana Genter China Labe, Galifornia 93555 Attus Technical Librery

Commanding Officer Noval Training Books Center Orlands, Florida 12811 Deputy Director and Chief Scientist Office of Havel Research Bream & Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena, California \$1101

Commanding Officer
Office of Neval Reveals & Beauth Office
419 South Deathorn Screet
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Commanding Officer
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
495 Sammer Street
Supton, Messachusells 44210

U. S. Post Office Department Library - Rosen 6612 12th & Pennsylvania Ave., N. W Washington, D. G. 20260

Commanding Officer
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
Box 19, 1790
New York, New York 04510 (4)

Project Manager
Common Positioning and Navigation
Systems
Atte. Herold M. Bahr (AMCPM-NS-1M)
Building 43:
U.S. Army Electronic Command
Fort Manmouth, Nav Jersey - 279;

Commanding Officer
U.S. Army Electronics R & D. Activity
White Sanda Missile Range
New Mayley 88002

Director of Faculty Research Department of the Air Force URAF Academy Galerado Springs, Calorado 80040

Richard O. Ulah (CRDARD-PO) U. S. Army Research Office (Dari Bus CM, Duke Station Durham, North Carolina, 4770b

Commanding Control
U. S. Army Strategic Comm. Command
Atta: SCC-CG-SAE
Port Huschorn, Arizona #1613

Cummending Officer
Herry Diamond Laboratories
Attn: Dr. Brethold Altman (AMXDO-E)
Connecticus Asenue and Yan Neos St. NW
Washington, D. C. 20438

Commanding Officer
Human Engineering Laboratories
Aberdeen Proving Ground
Maryland 21005

Commanding Officer
U. 5 Army Ballistics Research Lab
Attn: AMKRD-BAT
Aberdean Proving Ground
Aberdeen, Maryland 21005

Director, USAF Project RAND Via: Air Force Lieison Office The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California 90406 Attn: Library D

Director
U. S. Army Engineer Geodsey,
letelligence and Mapping
Research and Development Agency
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22040 Dr G. M. R Winhler Director, Time Service Division U. S. Naval Observatory Washington, D. C. 28290

Gommander, U.S. Havel Sec Atin: G43 3601 Metranha Avenue Washington, D. C. 20390

Division of Engineering and Applied 130 Pierce Hall Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusette 02138

European Office of Aurospace Research APO New York 09667

Frei. J. J. D'Anne Dopt. of Electrical Engineering Air Force Institute of Technology Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 49433

Lincoln Laboratory Measurements institute of Technology Lauragen, Mass. 92173

Professor Hichoiae George California Institute of Technology Passdena, California 91109

Dr. John C. Hanrock Head School of Electrical Engineering Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Hand, Technical Services Division Maral haristigative Service Hqu 4420 North Fairfax Drive Arlinaton, Virginia 22203

Unterse Communications Agency (340) Washington, D. C. (2031)

Dr. L. M. Hollinsworth AFCRL (CRN) L. G. Hanstom Freid Bedford, Massachusetts 01/51 Host Library Cornego-Mellon University Schemity Park Pattalorgh, Pa. 15211

The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory 8861 Georgio Avenue Silver Spring, Maryland 20010 Atm. Decimont Librarian

Lt. Cut. Robert B. Kaliach (SRES) Chief, Electronic Director Directorate of Engineering Sciences Are Force Office of Scientific Research Arlington, Vergior, 22209 (5)

U. S. Arm, Lamping Wor Laborators Arm, Technical Director Aberden-Proving Ground Aberdenn, Meryland (1995)

Commending Officer
Army Meterials Research
Waterfrom, Manach besetts 06112
After Dr. 11 Provid
Commending General
U.S. Army Yessets Agency
Artington IEL Section
Actington, Verginie 46412
Acting Dr. 1820
D. 1820
D.

Attn: Dentity

Commanding Officer and Director

U.S. Naval Underwater Sound Lab.
For Transball

New London, Connecticut, 08440

Defense Din inventation Center Attn: BDC-TCA Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22514 (20)

Det No. 6, OAR Air Force Unit Post Office Los Angeles, California 19045 Director Advanced Research Projects Agency Department of Defens Washington, D. C. 20101

Director for Materials Sopro ex Advanced Research Property Agency Department of Defense Washington, D. C. 20101

Director Columbia Radiation Laboratory Culumbia University SIW West 1800h Sirvet New York, New York 10027

Director Electronica Research Laboratory University of California Berbeiry, California 44720

Director Electronic Sciences Laboratory University of Southern California Los Angeles, Galifornia 10007

Mr. Rubert O. Parker, AMSEL-RD-S Executive Secretary, ISTAC U.S. Army Electronics Command Fort Munmouth, New Jessey, 0770;

Director National Security Agency Fort George G. Meade Maryland 20755 Attn: TDb

Director, Maval Research Laboratory Technical Information Officer Weshington, D. C. 20360 (b) Attn: Code 2627 (b) D- W C Hall, Code 7000 (l) D- W D Brodkinsky, Supt (l)

Dr A D Browning,
Director
Research Laboratory of Electronics
Manachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Manachusette 02139

Director Stanford Electronics Laboratories Stanford University Stanford, California 94305

Hes USAF (AFRDDD, The Pentagen Washington, D. C. 20310 likacie institute of Technology Buyt. of Electrical Regissering Chicago, Illinois 50615

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory Attn: Reports Library P. O. Box 1665 Los Alamos, New Memco 87544

Commender
U. S. Mavel Electronics Laboratory Cent
San Diego, California 95152 (2)
Attn: Library

The University of Arizona Bopt. of Electrical Engineering Torson, Arizona #5721 Dr. L. R. Mirman AFSC (SGT) Andrews Air Force Base Maryland 20331

Strector, Agreepace Mechanics Div. Frank J. Seiler Research Leboratory U. S. Air Force Academy Colorado Springs, Colorado 2012

Dr. G. J. Murphy
The Technological Institute
Northwestern University
Francisco Biscote 60201

Director
Arr Force Assumes Laboratory
Wright Patterson A38 Chin 45611

NASA Lawie Research Center Attn: Library 21000 Broudpark Road Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. Robert E. Fontana Systems Repearch Laboratories Inc. 7001 Indian Ripple Road Dayton, Ohio. 45440

Notical Instrumentation Group Bidg. 27, Rosen 101 Lawren e Radestion Laboratory University of California Berbeley, California 44740

Sylvania Electronic Systems Applied Research Laboratory Arts: Ste uments Librarian 40 Sylvan Road Waitham, Mass. 02154

Neval Electronics Systems Command ELEX 03, Rm. 2056 Monitons Bidg Dept. of the Nevy Washington, D.C. 20506 [2] Utah State University Dept. of Electrical Engineering Logan, Utah \$4321

Naval Ship Systems Command SHIP 055 Washington, D. C. 20140

Naval Ship Systems Command SHIP 031 Washington, D. C. 20140

New York University Cullege of Engineering New York, New York 10019

Dr. II. V. Noble (CAVT) Arr Fotes Avious & Laboratory Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio. 45651

Office of Depth, Director (Recent h and Information Rm., 101017) Department of Defense The Persignar Washington, D. C. 20101

Polytechnic Institute of Brood 35 Johnson Street Brooding, New York 11201 Attn: Mr. Jecome Don Research Goundinatur

Rome Atr Davelopment Center Griffies AFB, New York 1940 Atts. December Library (EMILD)

Raytheum Cu Bedford, Mass 01710 Attn. Lubration

AFSC (SCTIE) Andrews Air Futir Base Maryland 20111

Dr. A. A. Daugal.
Aust. Darre tur of Research
Office of Defenie Res. and Eng.
Department of Orlense
Washington, D. C. 20301

Union Carbido Corporation Rioctropic Division F. O. San 1269 Mountain View, California 14641

Dr. H. Robl, Deputy Chief Scientist U. S. Army Research Office (Durham) Ben Chi, Dube Station Durham, North Carolina, 27706 Durham, North Caroline 2770s

Br. Bleides J. Walkes

Electronics Properties Information
Highes Aircraft Company
Mail Baston 2-175

Guiver City, California 90210

School of Engineering Sciences Arizona State University Tompe, Arizona \$5281

Nos. SAMSO (MATTA/Le. Holono) AF Unit Post Office Les Angeles, California 10045

USAPSAM (SMISOR) Brooks Air Force Saco Tomo 78235

Syracuse University Department of Electrical Engineering Syracuse, New York 13210

Coverament Publications Section University of California Santa Barbera, California 93106 Atta: Library Engineering and Math. Sciences Library University of California at L. A. 405 Hilgred Avenue Los Angeles, California 40024

Prof Joseph E. Rowe, Chairman University of Michigan Electrical Engineering Department Am Arber, Michigan 68104

U. S. Army Musitions Command Atta: Technical Information Branch Picationey Arsenal, SMUPA-VA6 Dover, New Jersey 07801

U. S. Army Research Office Physical & Engineering Sciences Div 1045 Columbia Pika Arlington, Virguna 22204

Dr. A. D. Schutsler, AMSKL-HL-HVE MgM Vision Laboratory, USAECOM Fort Balvotr, Virginia 22060 Department of Electrical Engineering Texas Technological College Lubbock, Texas, 1940s

U. S. Navai Weapons Laboratory Dahlgren, Virginia 22448

He Lucky (Athorny The Pentagen Washington, D. C., 40150

Director
The Walter Reed Institute of Research
Walter Reed Medical Center
Washington, D. C. 20014

Stinctic Electronic Warsfer-Technical Area, AddEL-W7-M7 White Seeds Micotle Range New Marter, 8800

The University of Israe The University Libraries from City, Israe 52240

Lonkurt Electric Go, Inc. 1103 County Road San Carlos, California 94070 Alta: Mr. E. K. Patarson

Yale University Engineering Department New Haven, Connecticut 00520

Philos-Ferd Corporation Communications and Electronics Div Union Meeting and Jelly Roads Blue Rell, Pa 19422

Dr. Leo Young Stanford Research Institute Mento Park, Galifornia 74015

Ng AMD (AMR) Brooks Air Force Base Teass 78235

Mistion M. Pavane, Chief Al SC Scientific & Technical Literpos Office 46 Federal Plaza, Rm. 1311 New York, New York, 1982

Library (Godell (4) U. S. Navy Post Graduate School Montersy, California 91940 Atin: Technical Report Section

Director Ricetronics Research Center University of Texas at Austin Austin, Texas 78712

Mr. H. E. Webb (EMIR) Rome Air Development Genter Griffice Air Force Base New York 1 1440

Col. B. P. Gaines, Jr. ACDA/PO 1901 Fonneylytmia Ave., H.W. Washinston, D.C. 2045!

Mr. Billy Locke Tochmical Advisor. Requirements USAF Security Service Kelly Air Force Base, Texas. 78241

Wespuns Systems Evaluation Group Attn Column Binine O Vegt 400 Army-Navy Drive Arlangton, Virginia 22202

W A Ehrespacher, Assoc. Hand Systems Integration Division Code 5340A, Box 15 Naval Missale Center Point Muga, Californa 93041

Glen A. Mysre (Code 52Mv) Assoc Pref of Electrical Engineering Haval Pestgraduate School Mandarae Cabinerse 31040

Mr Horman J Field, AMSEL-RD-8 Chief, Office of Science and Technology R and D Directorate U S Army Electronics Command Fort Memmonth, New Jersey 07703

Redetens Scientific Information Center Atta: Chief, Document Section U.S. Army Missile Command Redetens Arsenal, Alabama 35809

Federal Aviation Administration Atta: Admin Sels Div (MS-110) 800 Independence Avenue, S W Washington, D C 20940

Mr M Zana Thorston, Chief Notwork Engineering, Communi-and Operations Branch Lester Phil Minimal Center for Biomedical Communications 5000 Rechville Pike Betheads, Maryland 20014

Security	Classi	fication

DOCUMENT CONT (Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing a		-	I would be districted by
1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)	imotation must be ci		CURITY CLASSIFICATION
Division of Engineering and Applied Phy	raica		lassified
Harvard University	5105	2b. GROUP	assined
Cambridge, Mass. 02138			
3. REPORT TITLE		L	
NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONI SINGULAR CONTROL PROBLEMS: A			MALITY FOR
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)			
Interim technical report			
5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name)			
David H. Jacobson and Jason L. Speyer			
6. REPORT DATE	78. TOTAL NO. OF	PAGES	7b. NO. OF REFS
March 1970	40		18
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	9a. ORIGINATOR'S	REPORT NUME	BER(S)
N00014-67-A-0298-0006 and NASA			
b. PROJECT NO. Grant NGR, 22-007-068	Technica	al Report	No. 604
c,			
ι.	this report)	RI NO(S) (Any of	her numbers that may be assigned
d.			
10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT	<u> </u>		
This document has been approved for puunlimited. Reproduction in whole or in			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING N	ALITARY ACTI	VITY
	Office o	of Naval R	esearch '
13. ABSTRACT	1		

Necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality for singular control problems are presented for the case where the extremal path is totally singular. The singular second variation is converted into a nonsingular one by addition of a quadratic functional of the control; a parameter $1/\epsilon$ multiplies this added functional. By allowing ϵ to approach infinity the optimality conditions are deduced for the singular problem from the limiting optimality conditions of the synthesized nonsingular second variation. The resulting conditions are Jacobson's sufficient conditions in slightly modified form. In a campanion paper necessity of Jacobson's conditions for a class of singular problems is demonstrated by exploiting the Kelley transformation technique which converts the singular second variation into a nonsingular one in a reduced dimensional state space.

DD FORM 1473 (PAGE 1)

S/N 0101-807-6811

Unclassified
Security Classification

Unclassified

Security Classification LINK A
Singular Arcs Optimal Control Theory
Singular Arcs Optimal Control Theory

DD FORM 1473 (BACK)

Unclassified
Security Classification